UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,619	09/15/2003	Hyun Jin Kim	7180-82423-01	9762
	7590 01/15/201 SPARKMAN, LLP		EXAMINER	
121 S.W. SALN	MON STREET		TRIMIEW, RAEANN	
PORTLAND, OR 97204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/662,619	KIM ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Raeann Trimiew	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Ju</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-41,48,51-53,56,57,63 and 64 is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-41,48,51-53,55-57,63 and 64 is/are 7) ☐ Claim(s) 50 and 55 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access Applicant may not request that any objection to the oregin and the correction of the	vn from consideration. rejected. election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/20/09.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22, 24-38, 40, 41, 48, 51-53, 56-57, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohama (2001/0031669) in view of Egashira et al (5,252,652). Regarding claims 1 and 41, Ohama discloses a golf ball core composition comprising 1,4-polybutadiene, peroxide (crosslinking agent), pentachlorothiophenol (peptizer) and 2-mercaptobenzothiazole (accelerator). Ohama broadly disclose the use of pentachlorothiophenols but does not disclose specific types such as metal salts or nonmetal salts. However, Egashira teaches organic sulfur compounds and metal containing organic compounds. Regarding claims 2-5, pentachlorothiophenol (peptizer) is present in the amount from 0.2 to 3.0 parts by weight. Regarding claims 6-9, 2-mercaptobenzothiazole (accelerator) is present in the amounts from 0.2 to 3.0 parts by weight. Regarding claims 10-12, peroxide (crosslinking agent) is present in the amount from 0.3 to 2 parts by weight. Regarding claim 13, the core composition is made from 1,4-polybutadiene. Regarding claims 14-17, the core composition includes filler such as zinc oxide and barium sulfate in the amounts from 5 to 30 parts by weight. Regarding claims 18 and 19, the core

Application/Control Number: 10/662,619

Art Unit: 3711

composition includes metal salts unsaturated carboxylic acid in the amount from 15 to 30 parts by weight. Regarding claim 20, the golf ball includes a core and cover, wherein the core is made from the composition (see above). Regarding claim 21, the core may include multiple layers, i.e. intermediate layer. Regarding claim 22, the state of the materials during manufacturing does not appear to affect the final product since the composition results a solid. Regarding claim 24, the golf ball includes a core, intermediate layer, and cover, wherein the core is made from the composition. Regarding claims 25-28, Ohama discloses a golf ball core composition comprising 1,4polybutadiene, peroxide (crosslinking agent), pentachlorothiophenol (peptizer), and 2mercaptobenzothiazole (accelerator). Peroxide (crosslinking agent) is present in the amount from 0.3 to 2 parts by weight. Pentachlorothiophenol (peptizer) and 2mercaptobenzothiazole (accelerator) are present in combination from 0.2 to 3.0 parts by weight. Ohama broadly disclose the use of pentachlorothiophenols but does not disclose specific types such as metal salts or nonmetal salts. However, Egashira teaches organic sulfur compounds and metal containing organic compounds. Regarding claim 29, the core composition is made from 1,4-polybutadiene. Regarding claims 30-33, the core composition includes filler such as zinc oxide and barium sulfate in the amounts from 5 to 30 parts by weight. Regarding claims 34 and 35, the core composition includes metal salts unsaturated carboxylic acid in the amount from 15 to 30 parts by weight. Regarding claim 36, the golf ball includes a core and cover, wherein the core is made from the composition (see above). Regarding claim 37, the core may include multiple layers, i.e., intermediate layer. Regarding claim 38, the state of the

Page 3

materials during manufacturing does not appear to affect the final product since the composition results a solid. Regarding claim 40, the golf ball includes a core, intermediate layer, and cover, wherein the core is made from the composition.

Regarding claims 48 and 53, the core composition includes metal salts unsaturated carboxylic acid. Regarding claim 51 and 56, the composition includes dicumyl peroxide.

Claims 52 and 57, the crosslinking agent may be 2, 5-dimethyl-2,5-di-(t-butylperoxy)hexyne-3. Claims 63 and 64, the cross linking agent may be 1,1-bis(t-butylperoxy)-3,3,5 tri-methylcyclohexane. One of ordinary skill in the art would substitute the non-metal salts for the metal salts since both appear to have the same function.

Claims 23 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohama (2001/0031669) in view of Egashira, and further in view of Sullivan (2001/0000506). Ohama discloses the invention but does not disclose a wound layer. Sullivan teaches a golf ball comprising a solid or wound layer over the core. One of ordinary skill in the art would include wound layer for lower manufacturing costs.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 50 and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Trimiew whose telephone number is 571-272-4409. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Raeann Trimiew/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711 Application/Control Number: 10/662,619

Page 6

Art Unit: 3711